REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

The specification and abstract have been reviewed and revised to improve their English grammar. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-27 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein and replaced by new claims 28-63.

Further, claims 28-63 have been drafted to further distinguish the present invention from the references relied upon in the rejections discussed below.

Claims 1-5, 11-15, 26 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nakasendou (JP 2002-123966). Further, claims 6, 10, 16, 17, 24 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Nakesendou and Ito (U.S. 2003/0218709). In addition, claims 7-9 and 18-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Nakasendou and Morikawa (U.S. 2005/0040340). These rejections are considered moot in view of the cancellation of claims 1-27 and are also believed clearly inapplicable to new independent claims 29-33 and claims 34-63 that depend therefrom for the following reasons.

Independent claim 28 recites an optical filter wherein (1) a first optically anisotropic crystal plate of a plurality of optically anisotropic crystal plates and a first substrate of a plurality of substrates are stuck together using a UV adhesive. Further, claim 28 recites that (2) one of a second optically anisotropic crystal plate of the plurality of optically anisotropic crystal plates and a second substrate of the plurality of substrates is stuck, using the UV adhesive, to one of the

first optically anisotropic crystal plate and the first substrate. Finally, claim 28 recites that (3) a thickness of the UV adhesive is no more than 1/20 of a thickness of at least one of the first and second optically anisotropic crystal plates and the first and second substrates. Nakasendou, Ito and Morikawa, or any combination thereof, fail to disclose or suggest above-mentioned distinguishing features (1)-(3) as recited in independent claim 28.

Initially, please note that the above-described 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a) rejections acknowledge that Nakasendou and Ito fail to disclose or suggest the UV adhesive and the thickness thereof, as now recited in new independent claim 28. In light of the above, the above-mentioned 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection relies on Morikawa for teaching the UV adhesive and the thickness thereof which are admittedly lacking from Nakasendou and Ito.

However, Morikawa merely teaches a method for laminating a deposited film (i.e., a metal oxide-deposited film) and other resin films using a curable adhesive layer having a thickness of 2.5 μm or more (see paragraph [0139] lines 1 and 2 and paragraph [0141], lines 2-6). In addition, Morikawa teaches that when the adhesive layer used to laminate the deposited/resin film is too large, tunnel, exudation, fine wrinkles or the like may occur; therefore, the adhesion amount is adjusted to have a dry film thickness between 3 and 5 μm (see paragraph [0141]). Moreover, Morikawa teaches that the deposited/resin film are laminated with the curable adhesive layer using a "dry lamination" system (see paragraphs [0139] and [0140]).

Thus, in view of the above, it is clear that Morikawa teaches laminating a deposited/resin film using a curable adhesive layer, but fails to disclose or suggest a first optically anisotropic crystal plate and a first substrate stuck together using a UV adhesive, as required by claim 28. For the same reasons, Morikawa also fails to disclose or suggest that one of a second optically

anisotropic crystal plate and a second substrate is stuck, using a UV adhesive, to one of the first optically anisotropic crystal plate and the first substrate, as required by claim 28. In other words, Morikawa's disclosure of a deposited/resin film, to which adhesive is applied, is not a disclosure or suggestion of a first optically anisotropic crystal plate and a first substrate, to which the UV adhesive is applied, as required by claim 28.

Further, in view of the above, it is apparent Morikawa teaches adjusting a thickness of the adhesive in order to avoid film related problems (e.g., tunnel, exudation, and fine wrinkles), but fails to disclose or suggest that a thickness of the UV adhesive is no more than 1/20 of a thickness of at least one of the first and second optically anisotropic crystal plates and the first and second substrates, as required by claim 28.

In other words, according to the structure required by claim 28, a thickness of the optically anisotropic crystal plate or the substrate will permit the thickness of the UV adhesive to be greater than 5 μm, which is a feature that is lacking from Morikawa.

Moreover, it is also noted that a person of ordinary skill in the art would understand that a substrate and an optically anisotropic crystal plate, of claim 28, would be stuck together by applying pressure thereto, rather than by using a dry laminate system, as disclosed by Morikawa.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that claim 28 and claims 34, 40, 46, 52 and 58 that depend therefrom would not have been obvious or result from any combination of Nakasendou, Ito and Morikawa.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Nakasendou, Ito and Morikawa or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Nakasendou, Ito and/or Morikawa to obtain the invention of independent claim 28.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 28 and claims 34, 40, 46, 52 and 58 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

New independent claims 29 and 30 are each directed to an optical filter and each recite features that correspond to the above-mentioned distinguishing features of independent claim 28. Thus, for the same reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 29 and 30 and claims 35, 36, 41, 42, 47, 48, 53, 54, 59 and 60 that depend therefrom are allowable over Nakasendou, Ito and Morikawa.

New independent claim 31 recites an optical filter wherein (1) a first optically anisotropic crystal plate of a plurality of optically anisotropic crystal plates and a first substrate of a plurality of substrates are stuck together using a UV adhesive. Further, claim 31 recites that (2) one of a second optically anisotropic crystal plate of the plurality of optically anisotropic crystal plates and a second substrate of the plurality of substrates is stuck, using the UV adhesive, to one of the first optically anisotropic crystal plate and the first substrate. Finally, claim 31 recites that (3) an amorphously bonded optical coating is formed on at least one of an end face on a ray incident side of the optical filter and an end face on a ray exit side of the optical filter. Nakasendou, Ito and Morikawa, or any combination thereof, fail to disclose or suggest above-mentioned distinguishing features (1)-(3) as recited in independent claim 31.

For the same reasons as discussed above regarding independent claim 28, Nakasendou, Ito and Morikawa fails to disclose or suggest distinguishing features (1) and (2) of independent claim 31.

In addition, in the above-mentioned rejections, the Examiner relies on paragraph [0007] of Nakesendou for teaching that anamorphously bonded optical coating is formed on at least one

of the end face on the ray incident side of the optical filter and an end face on a ray exit side of the optical filter, as required by claim 31.

However, paragraph [0007] of Nakesendou merely teaches that a PBS coat film 22 is applied to the entrance plane of a glass substrate 21 and a ¼ wavelength plate 23, which fails to disclose or suggest that anamorphously bonded optical coating is formed on at least one of the end face on the ray incident side and an end face on a ray exit side, as required by claim 31.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that claim 31 and claims 37, 43, 49, 55 and 61 that depend therefrom would not have been obvious or result from any combination of Nakasendou, Ito and Morikawa.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Nakasendou, Ito and Morikawa or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Nakasendou, Ito and/or Morikawa to obtain the invention of independent claim 31. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 31 and claims 37, 43, 49, 55 and 61 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

New independent claims 32 and 33 are each directed to an optical filter and each recite features that correspond to the above-mentioned distinguishing features of independent claim 31. Thus, for the same reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 32 and 33 and claims 38, 39, 44, 45, 50, 51, 56, 57, 62 and 63 that depend therefrom are allowable over Nakasendou, Ito and Morikawa.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Tatsuya SHOGAKI et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/
2008.08.22 13:27:38 -04'00'

By:_____
Andrew L. Dunlap
Registration No. 60,554
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
August 22, 2008